



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,065	09/09/2003	Nancy Lucas	CGL03/0351US01	9198
53175 7590 02/04/2011 CARGILL, INCORPORATED P.O. Box 5624 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-5624				
EXAMINER				
PASCUA, JES F				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3782				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/04/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/657,065

Applicant(s)

LUCAS ET AL.

Examiner

Jes F. Pascua

Art Unit

3782

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4,5,8-10,13-17,19,20,24,25,27-30,32,42,44,48-50,53,54,56,57,59 and 61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 2,4,5,8-10,13-17,19,20,24,25,27-30,32,42,44,48-50,53,54,56,57,59 and 61.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/03/2011 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 5, 15, 29 and 32 are objected to because of the following informalities: the "seam distal to the second handle" is improperly described by the adverb "forth" instead of the numerical noun --fourth--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 4, 5, 8-10, 13-15, 19, 20, 24, 25, 27-29, 32, 42, 44, 48-50, 53, 54, 59 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,593,229 to Warr and U.S. Patent No. 5,338,117 to Kucksdorf et al.

Warr discloses the claimed device, especially one end of the bag having a flap with a handle formed therein. However, Warr does not show the opposite end of the bag having a flap and handle with a construction similar to the flap and handle of the one end. Kucksdorf et al. discloses that it is known in the art to provide flaps and handles of similar construction at both ends of an analogous bag. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the opposite end of the Warr bag with a flap and handle similar construction to the flap and handle of the one end, as suggested by Kucksdorf et al., in order to provide convenient means for carrying the bag.

5. Claims 16, 17, 30, 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,593,229 to Warr and U.S. Patent No. 5,338,117 to Kucksdorf et al. as applied to claims 5, 15 and 29 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,103,389 to Salfisberg.

Warr and Kucksdorf et al. disclose the claimed device, as discussed above, except for the bag having a second tear seam at the second end. Salfisberg discloses that it is known in the art to provide a second tear seam at the second of a container. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the second end of the modified Warr bag with a second tear seam, as suggested by Salfisberg, in order to permit dispensing of the contents at either end of the bag.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2, 4, 5, 8-10, 13-17, 19, 20, 24, 25, 27-30, 32, 42, 44, 48-50, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59 and 61 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant is duly reminded that a complete response must satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F. R. 1.111, including: "The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. A general allegation that the claims "define a patentable invention" without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. Moreover, "The prompt development of a clear Issue requires that the replies of the applicant meet the objections to and rejections of the claims." Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP 714.02 and MPEP 2163.06. The "disclosure" includes the claims, the specification and the drawings.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jes F. Pascua whose telephone number is 571-272-4546. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Newhouse can be reached on 571-272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jes F. Pascua/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3782